



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

DELIVERED ON MONDAY, MARCH 29, 1920, AT COLUMBUS,
OHIO, AT THE THIRTY-SIXTH MEETING OF THE
MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

BY EDWARD C. ARMSTRONG

TAKING COUNSEL WITH CANDIDE

In the days of turmoil upon which we entered in 1914 and from which in 1918 many hoped and some believed that we were issuing, in days such as caused hesitation at the sight of freshly-printed pages lest they but magnify a disquietude grown to be part of our innermost selves, a new book appeared which brought cheer beyond the measure of its theme. A citizen-soldier, a quiet thinker, swept into the vortex, who had given things closest and dearest and whose life itself was to be the final measure of the sacrifice, wrote of the war wherein he was a part, and thru the written word we could look into the author's soul and see it was serene; not the serenity of blind resignation and still less the serenity of despair, but the serenity of a soul that has weighed and judged—yes, and has struggled—and is tranquil. Adrien Bertrand fought, and yet was not in fighting mood. He gave whole-heartedly his physical and intellectual forces to the defence of his land, but let no foe penetrate to the inner citadel of his being; there peace never ceased to reign. And now that many war books more widely read at first have lost their message, Bertrand's *Appel du Sol* is as timely as it

was three years ago, and remains a call to patriotic effort in days when unselfish devotion no longer takes its measure from the greatness of the need.

One could but feel, serenely as Voltaire might sleep ahead, that the disturbances of these latter times must in the long run awaken Candide, witness to ways of war and warriors; and when Candide did bestir himself and in 1917 reappeared upon the scene, our acquaintance with the *Appel du Sol* made us glad he came with Bertrand as his cicerone. In the *Orage sur le Jardin de Candide*, Bertrand takes us to the banks of the Bosphorus, into the villa where Candide had thought to end his days, but where a genial immortality awaited him—an immortality whose unending chain of hours he employs in the avocations at which Voltaire had left him.

Upon this peaceful nook there breaks a tempest of unmeasured violence, driving one by one to the shelter of Candide's roof-tree buffeted travelers in the night, whom Candide greets and gathers round his hearth: the Abbé Jérôme Coignard, Mr. Pickwick, Don Quixote, Achilles, Dr. Faust, and with them Lieutenant Vaisselle, the young *agrégé* in philosophy who in Bertrand's former book had interpreted for us the summons to the sons of France of France's soil. The theme in that evening gathering is war: less this latter war which has brought them together than philosophy of war, its causes and effects. Two of the group contribute but brief parts to the symposium. Achilles finds in his antecedents little to facilitate interchange of thoughts, and in the reasoning of his fellow guests much that to him appears too subtle to be grasped. Candide, among such notables, is slow to interpose his views, and his mind is filled with visions of the ravages the storm is bringing upon his citrons and his roses. No heart has he to apply to the upheavals of our world the

lesson long instilled by Pangloss. From time to time a word to link up war with the ruin of the fruits of patient tilling: that is all. And yet, when the others have concluded, it is he who guides them out at the first gleam of newly coming dawn to his lawns and orchards, his vineyards and his kitchen garden, where only the bare earth remains; and it is in his garden that they promptly set themselves to work—not less heartily Achilles than the rest—to wipe out vestiges of thunderbolt and hurricane, and to plant the seeds for future harvests. As Voltaire's *Candide*, at the conclusion of his search for earthly perfection, left his lesson in the message: "*Il faut cultiver notre jardin*," so Bertrand's *Candide* summed up war's philosophy for those thinkers of all climes with a steadfast: "*Travaillons!*"

Small ground has there been so far to find in this exhortation a quality of prophetic vision; all the more is it desirable, in our first gathering as an association since the discordant voice of man-made implements of war gave place to the noisy weapon which comes to us as the free gift of mother nature, that we study how to restore the fruitfulness of our own corner of earth, and how, in so doing, to furnish a useful example to our fellow-men. With the laying down of arms we had looked for peace, and in its train a return to creative toil. To-day we are farther than ever away from the one and from the other, and are realizing that it is thru the second that we must reach the first: that only by centering desires and energies upon intensified industry can we hope to attain to peace, and that the sole peace awaiting us at the end of any other paths is the quiet of the desert or the grave.

Since doubtless we are united upon the necessity of girding up our loins, our first need is to determine what goal we set ourselves. Is it merely a return to the status

disturbed by the coming of the war? Even so, we have no easy road ahead, for he is an optimist who finds in this year's teaching or research a semblance of our former activities. And are we setting ourselves an adequate goal if this be all that we shall strive for? Whether compared with the monetary outlay or compared with the time and effort which we expended day by day and year by year, how great were the returns in scientific output, in promising young scholars, in educated citizens? Those returns seem inadequate not alone when measured absolutely, but when we regard what some of our sister nations did accomplish. I can hear the response that rises to many lips: "Why tell this to us? How can the best, how can any, results come under a system wherein the teacher, from end to end of his career, can not relax his vigilance lest he fall a prey to the wolf that does not quit his door? And if you cite what may have been accomplished elsewhere, do not forget, while making the comparison, the time and effort we must give to supplementary tasks. What time have we for study, what freshness left for teaching, when we pass from the class-room to a never-ending round of committees to be met, statistical tables to be drawn up, questionnaires to be answered; when, all this done, mayhap we spend the minutes that remain in laboring to convince those who have the final word that academic two and two make four? What spirit of work is there left in a man if he sees the resources of his institution ever anew allotted, not to lessening the burdens of the men who are at their posts, not to making adequate provision for the subjects which are on the list, but to creating new departments of study or to adding new bricks and mortar that serve but to impoverish the more?"

Each of these griefs is grievous, and each only too often real; but my conviction grows stronger and stronger that

we ourselves have a full part of responsibility for what has been, and ourselves the power to bring the remedies. It is true that as individuals you and I are at a disadvantage, but as a professional group we have the elements which should make ours the weightiest word in all questions of academic policy and practice, and one element alone preventing this. That one element is our individualistic attitude. Rarely can we bring ourselves to join in collective effort. We deplore our having so little say, and yet how uncommon it is that we unite to voice a common will. Have you ever participated in the efforts of a faculty, on its own initiative, to formulate and maintain an opinion on a measure of any complexity? Have you ever wrestled with the problem of persuading a faculty group who agree on a general proposition to accommodate their differences of view on its details? Have you never remarked that in the long run some who protest the most vigorously against the usurpations of executives trust rather to working out their problems with those executives than to submitting them to the criticism of their peers? Having myself thus participated, thus wrestled, and I fear at times thus trusted, I am disposed to believe that we have had nearly as much democracy as we ever really invited.

Objecting in theory to executive encroachments, we ourselves not only render such encroachments easy, but we even force them upon our executives. The institution must have within it authority in some form, deputed or self-constituted, and this authority takes the features of a monarchy or an oligarchy when, if not deliberately, at least unthinkingly, we *will* that it be so. Our executives have in the main come from our midst, and yet is it after all surprising that many even of those who were at the start the most democratic have become the victims of the system which we ourselves have fostered?

The same lack of co-ordinated effort manifests itself when we view our educational system from a national, rather than from an institutional, standpoint. It is significant, and it is characteristic, that not until a few years ago have our college and university teachers possessed a common medium for deliberation and action. We have already been able to observe the rapidity with which that medium, once created, has become invaluable in crystalizing opinion and in giving it a voice.

It is from phenomena like these that we can locate the first, and a fundamental, factor in the betterment of our work. We must lend our full aid to solving the problem of co-ordinated effort. The Association of University Professors furnishes an example of one way in which such effort can be furthered, and the local chapters of that association provide an excellent nucleus for the development of professional consciousness within each institution. We have turned toward the light, and we must move forward. Heaven bless the individualist! When he is intelligent and forceful, and when he is possessed of a sense of humor, he is the salt of the faculty. May his tribe persist, but may it persist in lesser quantity!

Happily, recourse to the extreme of Oslerizing measures may not prove requisite in order to hasten the reduction of this over-abounding blessing; for there are signs, in the institutions where the faculty has formed into an independent deliberative group, that our weakness as a guild is not inherent, and that once we have set ourselves seriously to act in unison it turns out to be less difficult than we had foreseen. We are finding that we can attain to real deliberation, and that more of our problems than we thought are common problems, more of our interests common interests. We are learning also that, when we discover a way to give voice to the wish of the majority, the

other parties to our institutional government can realize that this lightens their burdens and simplifies their task. Let us look for no utopia. It is not to be anticipated that faculty decisions will ever even distantly approach infallibility, or that we shall uniformly be able to subordinate selfish interests to the common good, but these decisions should in the long run prove as wise and as just as those of any other group of men, and we shall at least be imposing them upon ourselves and not receiving them from without.

In considering the lack of organic correlation among our university men, we are dealing with a single phase of what has constituted in America the most serious hindrance to the development of an adequate conception of the true spirit of the *universitas*. Our scheme of education has grown up around the local unit, each community advancing slowly and painfully in an adjustment of its education to its individual needs and its individual outlook. But why should this not be the soundest of processes, the best adapted to create a system in accord with our genius, the best qualified to contribute, to the solution of universal educational problems, new and important elements? Is this not more fruitful than a transference wholesale to our shores of some system evolved under conditions different from our own? Does this not mean that, while we have drawn from the general stock of human experience our basal ideas, we have fashioned them homogeneously in our own molds? And is this not after all the very process whereby other peoples have built up their educational structures? Progression from the individual to the general is in fact a natural and a wholesome way to grow, and it results in an organic system—provided that the advance from the particular to the general keeps pace with the advance in complexity. It is, however, from the

rapidity of our growth that our most serious problem has arisen. Within half a hundred, often within a score, of years there has been increase in size, in extension, in complexity which in a natural process of evolution would have been spread over centuries, and during this disconcertingly rapid shift there has existed no central authority to guide, to normalize, to generalize.

Reference has already been made to the constant extra tasks that blight the teacher's enthusiasm and consume the time and strength he owes to teaching and research. Why is it that he should have these things to do, day after day, year after year, in quantity augmenting rather than diminishing? In part it is because by a false economy his valuable time is taken up in routine work that would be better and quicker done by a clerk of six weeks' training; but in far larger measure it is because, in hundreds and hundreds of schools, we are laboriously and in the insufficient light of local experiences studying out questions that are being or have been decided in the same inadequate fashion over and over again; questions in which a standardized solution would be readily accepted by all and would be far more satisfactory than most of the many divergent solutions which are adopted.

This waste of energy is but one of the evils entailed by our lack of system, but it is a characteristic specimen from a whole class whose countersign is duplication: duplication at times due to ignorance, at times to harmful rivalry. We fail to make use of the lessons which others have already learned, and we spend our time and substance in half-way doing each what the other does. How long could the banking establishments of our country run their business without the clearing-house, above all were each trying to conduct banking, bonding, insurance, and even at times along with these an advertizing agency and a department-store annex?

Thus we see in the looseness of the tie uniting the members of our profession a reflex of the lack of any satisfactory bonds whatever within our educational system, just as this academic situation is itself a detail in the constitution of our whole social and political fabric, thoroly characteristic of a country where biennially forty-eight different assemblies convene to legislate each for its own locality regarding taxation, education, railroads, sweat-shops, marriage, divorce, cigarette-smoking, and the length of the gunning season or of bathing suits.

And we may further remark that, just as the absence of a collective will within our faculties has evoked and even imposed autocratic administration in our colleges, so the parallelism in the general conditions will almost inevitably impose sooner or later upon our whole educational system a co-ordination which is liable to come from without—nay, which will assuredly come from without—unless it be soon enough fashioned from within. So manifest is the need for general direction that many have proposed and urged recourse to the federal government for a solution. Shall we have a cabinet officer as director of our education as we have a Secretary of War? Shall we have a national university with a function paralleling that of the War College or of the General Staff? Must we have undergone our travail of soul and of body thru all the period of laissez-faire only that we may in the end adopt the educational bureaucracy to which centuries of adaptation have but half resigned our elder-sister nations? Some would assent, accepting any co-ordinating measure in preference to the chaos which has till now existed. But if this be our only choice, would that at least we might have accepted it at the birth of our republic, and thus have been spared the waste and wear of all the intervening years, so costly and so meaningless if out of them nothing

is to come for which we lacked the models and the warnings a full century ago! I hope and trust that this is not our only, nor our best, alternative.

That we have wider room for choice, signs are not lacking. The most spectacular among these tokens are the great Foundations established by private generosity to do for us what we have so long omitted to accomplish for ourselves. Their record of attainment is not without its imposing features. To cite an example, the marked advance toward standardization of medical education in recent years is largely due to the impulse given by a Foundation of this type. To a kindred source we can trace the notable effort there has been to find a common definition for a "point," and the notable consecration of microscopes to bringing to light the fourteen points, less two, that for a time were trusted to make the academic world safe for a pension.

In various domains these foundations have substantially contributed to the creation or to the elevation of standards. Few of us could view with complacency the loss of the good which they have accomplished, and even those few would hardly relinquish the strenuous recreation we find in efforts to shed light upon their pathway. Yet the fact remains that such philanthropic organizations are born of our weakness and not of our strength, and that in their very constitution they bear the marks of the paternalistic conception from which we are striving to turn. It is doubtful whether any substantial number of those who oppose, or even of those who favor, governmental direction of education could be rallied to the alternative of direction exercised by or thru foundations of this type, and there is small prospect that we should elect for them to be our masters. There are those who believe, it is true, that such an eventuality is not remote, and should we continue in a

state of aimless drifting there might be ground for their anxiety; but I have confidence that these foundations, as at present constituted, mark rather a transitional feature of a changing epoch than a definitive element in our system. And, as such a transitional feature, they strikingly exemplify two significant points: the potentialities of co-ordination and the possibility of its existence aside from governmental control.

Before or while these foundations were taking form, there have arisen associations of various sorts, born of the spontaneous desire for the interchange of opinion among those who had kindred problems to solve: associations of colleges, of universities, of state or of private institutions; groupings which often overlap, sometimes clash, and are no doubt unduly numerous, but which constitute a series of experiments whereby we are trying out various degrees and various phases of volunteer co-operation, and are growing familiar with a co-ordination which is neither urged upon us from without nor forced upon us from above, but built up from within. The educational foundations have accustomed us to organizations of large scope for the purpose of investigating conditions and formulating conclusions. The inter-institutional associations have furnished working models of the spontaneous association of interested parties for somewhat similar ends. The two types have in common the feature that they can only recommend and can not legislate, and in both instances we have learned that much can be brought to pass thru well matured recommendations without the backing of authoritative sanction.

Out of a blending of these two models there is gradually being evolved a type of central clearing-house for educational matters whose characteristic features are that it is constituted by the institutions and the inter-academic as-

sociations and looks to them for the continuance of its existence; that it has broad functions in investigation and recommendation, but that its conclusions carry with them only the authority they derive from their inherent weight, their representative character, and the willingness of the individual institutions to accept them. In this seemingly weak type of organization there are large possibilities of moral force, and in so far as it can make and keep itself the mouthpiece of the leading thinkers in our fields it can mightily promote standardization, and a standardization not imposed but voluntarily accepted. In this type of clearing-house are we not catching a glimpse of the prototype of a general directing force in education which may bring to us the advantages that come from organized effort and yet not cost us the blessings of individual liberty and individual initiative?

This is no brief for a multiplication of machinery, but a suggestion of what may be a way to suppress much useless duplication both of machinery and of routine drudgery. To this end let us as individuals do all we can to promote co-ordination of effort within our faculties, within the membership of our profession, and among the institutions with which we are connected. Here is one way whereby we can prepare for something larger and better than the mere recovery of the ground we occupied before the war.

If what I have said is to be accounted an exposition of my text, then *il faut cultiver notre jardin* may well seem to be Englished by 'my field is the world.' The justification I offer for the introduction of so general a theme in this gathering of Modern Language specialists is not only the fundamental importance in the present crisis of weighing most carefully our basal educational problems, but also the bearing that the situation I have discussed may have

upon a question that has again and again been before the members of this association, that has more than once been referred to in our presidential addresses, and that has certainly never received its final answer.

We are united into an association whose stated purpose is to advance the study of the Modern Languages, and whose stated method for attaining such advance is thru the promotion of friendly intercourse and scholarly publication, and thru the presentation and discussion of papers in periodic meetings of the members. This platform commits us as an association to the promotion of scientific research and of the scientific attitude of mind; there is a significant absence of assertion of other aims, but an absence also of any specific exclusion of other aims. The language of our constitution points with sufficient clearness to the intent of its framers and yet avoids a rigid prescription. So far as my own observation goes of the attitude within the association, it is that a majority of the members have been agreed in considering our normal function to be the promotion of research; that a certain number of these members have always viewed with disapprobation any deviation from treating this normal function as our exclusive function; and yet that from our origins up to now we have not ceased to maintain a certain contact with and to exercise a certain supervision over the teaching problems of our subject.

Such an intervention of the association, whether to be desired or to be feared, was all but inevitable. In the absence of any other medium thru which the pressing problems of Modern Language teaching could be dealt with, there hardly existed a possibility of the Association's declining to accept this supervision as one of its duties; even viewed exclusively from the standpoint of the promotion of research, it was essential that we bring some

order into our work as teachers if any research whatever was to be practicable. The good accomplished by such a report as was made to the Association in 1898 by the Committee of Twelve is beyond our power to estimate, and the chairman of the committee, who has so lately gone from among us, has no need of any advocate to establish that his devotion and his services to scholarship were in no wise diminished by his leadership in this incursion into the domain of methodology.

If we sum up our attitude, we may say that in the past we have been, in desire and by definition, a scientific society, but that under the pressure of necessity we have repeatedly exercised some of the functions of a pedagogical society. I think that a large majority of us have looked upon this mixed status as being provisionally unavoidable, but that few if any have been ready to accept it as a permanency. It has been no more satisfactory to such as might have wished to make of the association a frankly pedagogical organization than to those who would rigidly exclude from its ken all but scholarship.

So let us, in this our first survey of the garden plot since the hurricane swept over it, begin by trying to stake off its future metes and bounds. Has not the moment arrived when we have both the right and the duty to concentrate our energies on what has ever been our main object of endeavor and what many have held should be our exclusive aim?

The right to confine ourselves more strictly to our field has become ours because agencies now exist whose normal function it is to take charge of certain things which we in the past have had to do. Many questions of concern to groups of our teachers or to all of them are now disposed of by such organizations as the Federation of Modern Language Teachers. Other questions, too broad in their

scope, too closely interwoven with kindred problems in adjacent fields to receive their best study from a purely parochial angle, may now be handled by some central bureau of investigation which can command the large resources, the broad experience, the systematic organization that are requisite. For the past year or more many of us have been convinced that the times demand most pressing a broad survey of our whole modern foreign language domain. Questions of scholarly import would be involved which are of keen interest to this association; many other questions would be of a type attaching particularly to the teaching of our subjects. I trust that such a survey will be made, but I also sincerely hope, for the best interests of the Association and of the survey itself, that it can be intrusted with proper guarantees to an organization of the kind to which I have just alluded.

Not only have we the right, now that other agencies have come into being that render this possible, to restrict ourselves to our field, but it is more than ever before incumbent upon us to do so. Our association is the special guardian of the interests of productive scholarship, and those interests have need of our undivided support. Upon us Americans there rests a larger share of responsibility than ever before, for we are to a far less degree than other nations affected by present conditions unfavorable to scholarly work. How grievous the gaps in the scholarly ranks, and how heavy the handicaps under which our European colleagues are laboring! After the long years in which we have looked to them for stimulus and guidance, can we not carry a more substantial part of the load in this the time of their adversity? The workers in the Modern Languages are dealing with subjects that lend themselves to the furthering of international solidarity in scholarship at a time when this is more than ever essential,

and so can render especially important service. The call to us as an association to do our full part is imperious, and it is the more urgent because the times are such as do not lend themselves to scholarly pursuits. The overwhelming waste of war, and the formidable moral slackening that is following in war's track, are giving rise to a materialistic current which demands united and aggressive action if we are to stand up against it. And yet, if we but manifest the needful courage and the needful industry, there is no real ground for alarm regarding the future of scholarship and of scholarly education. I am weary of the talk of 'practical' studies; weary of hearing that our colleges and universities should prepare their students for 'life,' if by life you mean the amassing of dollars and automobiles. Shall we let ourselves be cowed by a bogey? Whither would such a conception of our functions lead us? Whither did its dominance lead the Germans? Whither would it have led the French had the minority who favored the materially easy way out been able to carry the day? What shall it profit a man even materially if you show him how to gather wealth and are not furnishing the spiritual checks and balances? Inevitably there will come the day when even his sordid material gains will be swept away by a society where those who have not will remain more numerous than those who have, and where that majority will bring down in ruins the whole structure in the effort to seize in their turn the lion's share. The menace to society to-day is that we have developed a complex material civilization out of proportion to the intellectual and spiritual leadership which we have been able to develop, and unless we can fortify and multiply this leadership the structure threatens to collapse upon our heads. The function of our higher institutions is not to teach how to make a living but to increase the

number of eligible leaders. It is we who are the 'practical' men in our domain if we are instilling a love of truth and beauty, and affording a training in clear and exact thinking. In so doing it is we who are giving the only solidity and permanence even to the material elements in the structure of our present society.

With any correct estimate of relative values, we are well to the front among the practical men of our age if we live up to high scholarly standards. We had always been disposed to acquiesce in the widespread belief that our studies removed us so far from contact with the world of affairs that we were unfitted to play a part in it—until the war came to jolt us into a realization that clear thinking and scientific method count wherever they are put to work. I recently had an opportunity to observe one of the French universities: how France drew upon its stock of trained intelligence and how powerfully that intelligence served in the most practical and important of the war tasks. It was one of the professors in that university who, after a long life in his study and lecture room, was transferred to the innermost circles of the war department, where the unerring deductions drawn by his trained mind from seemingly insignificant data in captured *Soldatenbücher* determined during a period of three years the disposition and redispotion along the front of numberless French army corps. Another member of the same faculty was set at the unacademic task of bringing to naught the machinations of hostile spies along his country's southern border—an undertaking which he carried out with marked success, directing it, not from his office desk, but from their very haunts in foreign territory. These are but samples from a list which a single university can offer, nor do we have to go so far afield as Europe in order to gather evidence of similar import. Within the mem-

bership of our own association there are, as you well know, examples of the application of scholarly training and method to our war problems with no less signal success. The fear has even been expressed that the ranks of our profession will be gravely depleted now that we have come to suspect that it is easier in the domain of business than in our own circles to make a favorable showing with the same expenditure of thought and effort. Instead of diminishing the prestige of scholarship, the war has given it a weight it did not have before. That prestige will be compromised only if we ourselves abandon its defence. Let us put our heart into making its hold upon our nation sufficient to stem the tide of loose and careless thinking.

In the course of this discussion I have endeavored to show that other agencies have now arisen which can adequately discharge functions which our association has hitherto felt called upon to exercise, and that this has come to pass at a time when there is more than ever a need for the concentration of our energies on the stimulation of scholarly activities and of a scholarly attitude of mind. In this connection it is worth while to pause a moment to note two propositions now before the Association. The first of these is an invitation which has come to us to accept associate membership in the American Council on Education. This Council is rendering valuable service in the collection and dissemination of information and in linking our institutions together, and it is concerned with a number of questions which affect the interests of our membership. It looks to us as a source for expert advice in the field of the Modern Languages, and we can look to it to take over questions which we from time to time may desire to refer to it for investigation. Its co-operation provides a possible medium for handling various matters which we have never felt at liberty to leave uncared for.

A further invitation now before us opens the way for the Association to adhere as a charter member to the American Council of Learned Societies, which is itself the national branch of the newly constituted International Union of Academies wherein all American research societies devoted to humanistic studies have been invited to participate. The American Council has already been organized, and pending our action upon the invitation a member of the Modern Language Association attended the first meeting. We could form part of no grouping of scholars in fuller unison with the purposes of our Association, and I do not doubt that our response to the invitation will be as hearty as has been that of the other societies comprised in the plan. While speaking of groupings of scholars, it is interesting to note the establishment last year in England of the Modern Humanities Research Association. Subsequent to the founding of the Modern Language Association of America, the British formed a society with a similar designation, but it early assumed the character of a pedagogical society, leaving free the domain which has now been occupied by this new organisation. In his presidential address at their first gathering, Sir Sidney Lee described the Research Association as being similar in its aims to the American Modern Language Association, and voiced the hope that the bonds of affiliation between us be close, a hope which we most cordially echo.

These are times in which he is rash who claims in any realm to have a vision of what the fates are holding in their lap, and amid such uncertainties there is no choice save to reserve final decision in many questions till we see more clearly what the future has in store. This is but a reason why we must make ready, should the days prove brighter than any gone before, to profit by the full measure of their opportunity, and a stronger reason still why

we must prepare ourselves, should added dangers and difficulties lie ahead, to meet and overcome them. Wait we shall since wait we must, but not in helpless hesitation. All things come to him who waits, we say with care-free readiness to welcome, in guise of proverbs, large beams of falsehood for their mote of truth. As a people we have done our share of waiting, watchful or wasteful as the case may be, and we have learned the price of attempting to realize an army while you wait, one-hundred-per-cent. American citizens out of eager aliens while you wait, victory or an international policy or a world peace while you wait. The French, prone to demand a closer squaring of their proverbs with the truth, speak with due caution and with a sounder basis when they say: "*Tout vient à point à qui sait attendre*," 'There's always a right moment comes to him who is canny in waiting.' May our canni-ness show itself by our making of this waiting period a time for trying out a fuller co-ordination of our energies, a better distribution of our tasks.

In our less lengthy session I have already spent substantially more words than did, in all that long and stormy night, the gentle host of the distinguished group who sought the shelter of his villa at the behest of Bertrand. My broidery upon the text of *Candide* will quickly pass to its well-earned oblivion, and yet the exposition will not have been without its value if its tedium serve as a foil to the single word of his that more than sums up all that I have said, and if we seek, as the highroad to peace on earth, the tranquillity of soul that will come alone thru our putting into action the lesson of his message: *travaillons!*